



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM "MODERATE" AND "ADVANCED."

THE frequent recurrence of such terms as "moderate," "advanced" or "hypercritical" in literature relating to the study of the Old Testament is often astonishing to those whose work lies in other fields, and it may be doubted whether any one could define them adequately without at least an unconscious reference to his own particular standpoint. But standpoints vary, and while the most moderate of critics are styled "extreme" by those who support traditional views, the latter themselves not rarely promulgate or accept theories which are woefully arbitrary and detrimental to the traditions themselves. It may be supposed that the more "moderate" criticism represents the minimum of criticism, the slightest and most indispensable deviation from the traditional standpoint, while the more "advanced" or "extreme" criticism is that which departs more widely from the accepted traditional view or appears "hypercritical" in so far as it seems to be unnecessary, arbitrary or fantastic. Biblical criticism must needs concern itself with the investigation of the internal phenomena, and divergence of opinion (and necessarily also the use of the above terms) turns upon the legitimacy or adequacy of the proposed explanations and even upon the very existence of the phenomena in question. It may be fairly said that the progress of Biblical criticism hangs upon the recognition of the internal data and their relation to external evidence, and it will sometimes be found that the criticism which appears to be extreme or hypercritical is really the more consistent application of conclusions already accepted by the more "moderate" critics. How far this may be justified can be judged from the remarks which arise out of a perusal of some recent aids to Biblical study which call for a brief notice in these pages.

For the systematic study of a people's history it is obvious that everything which throws light upon internal or external conditions is directly or indirectly valuable, and the Biblical student cannot therefore confine himself too closely to that literature which for various reasons has been set upon a plane by itself. No excuse is needed for including among "recent aids" a book on the Additions

to Daniel by the Rev. W. H. Daubney¹. The author comments upon the prejudice which has long existed in this country against the Apocrypha as a whole, and succeeds in demonstrating that these three portions deserve more serious attention than they have frequently received. His careful collection of material which had to be "quarried and brought together from varied and distant sources" provides the reader with interesting and useful evidence of a varied nature. Each portion is handled separately under the headings—analysis, title and position, authorship, date and place of writing, object, text, language and style, religious and social state, theology, chronology, and canonicity. Each has its section on its position in early Christian literature and art, and it is with an eye to the Sixth Article that attention is drawn to the utility of each for "Example of Life and Instruction of Manners." The author deals provisionally with the critical problems, realizing that there are many questions which must be left open, upon which it would be unwise to pronounce dogmatically, and it is one of the merits of the book that evidence is set before the reader and not its bearing upon the views of the author. The Rev. Daubney, in fact, has undertaken the initial labour of collecting the accessible data and of presenting them in a readable form, and those who desire to pursue the problems of the three additions will find his book in every respect helpful.

The difficulty of finding *decisive* criteria for the dates of the additions to Daniel will be appreciated when it is perceived that those which appear to be valid are often ambiguous. The "Song of the Three Children" contains a definite reference to a state of subjection and reproach which, in common with the whole of Azariah's prayer, associates itself with similar passages in Ezra ix, Neh. ix, Dan. ix, Baruch ii (cp. also 2 Chron. xxix. 8-10). Is this decisive? The first verse of "Bel and the Dragon" (accession of Cyrus) causes some difficulty in a narrative where the Babylonian king is otherwise nameless, and one is reminded that similar notices (headings of prophecies, titles of Psalms) invariably stand in need of unprejudiced examination. In fact, the Vulgate places this verse at the end of the "History of Susanna," the LXX omit it, and there is the possibility that it is intended to fit the story into a kind of historical framework. Now, in the first place, it is very evident that there were many stories connected with Daniel, and some of these, as the versions suggest, were current in various forms. Similar variations in Tobit and Judith, and a comparison of the first two books of the Maccabees, indicate that a considerable body of literary tradition was once current, and

¹ *The three Additions to Daniel. A Study* (Cambridge, Deighton Bell & Co., 1906).

if we observe in detail the character of the evidence in the book of Jubilees, it is plain that it becomes difficult to draw the line between particular elements which have found a place in the Old Testament and the related features which lie elsewhere outside the Old Testament. The question of the merits of the Apocryphal 1 Esdras and the tendency to find literature of the Maccabaeen age in the Old Testament combine to prove that the two bodies of literature cannot be severed for the purposes of historical and literary investigation.

In the second place, the Daniel of the Apocrypha, and of the book which bears his name, is the Daniel as he appeared at the time when the traditions were put into writing, but he is not the Daniel whom Ezekiel, writing in the early years of the Exile, could place upon the same level with Noah and Job (xiv. 14, 20). It is hardly possible to determine with any confidence what may be called the underlying figure of Daniel in the pre-exilic age, since it is well known that the same figure will be clothed differently among different circles and in different ages. Any one can see, moreover, that the prophets who present themselves in the "Ascension of Isaiah," the "Apocalypse of Baruch," or the Apocryphal "Book of Baruch" are not precisely those whom we meet in the Old Testament. To some extent they are represented as they appeared in later ages, and their traditions now have features which are seen to be entirely foreign to their earlier shape. Consequently, it is particularly important to observe the use and development of earlier traditions in indisputable examples in order to appreciate the significance of *apparently* similar features elsewhere.

Now, in the third place, we have to observe that in the "Apocalypse of Baruch" the destruction of Jerusalem and the captivity in Jeremiah's time have been used for circumstances which may be six centuries later. The apocryphal book of Baruch itself has until quite recently been frequently taken to be a genuine work on the strength of evidence which appeared to be perfectly valid. A critical study has proved, however, that the criteria were entirely ambiguous, and at the same time has allowed us to perceive the kind of evidence which is really decisive. The experience gained thereby can undoubtedly be employed elsewhere. Old Testament history allows only one supreme catastrophe, although there are many references which plead strongly for the recognition of a disaster similar to that of 586 B.C., but later, the nature of which unfortunately can only be conjectured. On the one hand, the repetition of similar events can lead to a similarity of literary treatment, and, on the other, a number of passages, which at first might appear to refer to the same events, may preserve internal features so distinctive, that different historical

backgrounds must necessarily be inferred. As in the case of the allusions in the Song of the Three Children, the most decisive indications of date will be based upon a careful study of the progress and development of thought and religion rather than upon details which appear to be of historical value¹.

We turn next to the knotty problem of Biblical chronology. The Rev. D. R. Fotheringham's study on the *Chronology of the Old Testament*² leads to some novel results. The scheme he advocates is partially a reversion to systems of an earlier date. "This is true in that it is essentially a Biblical chronology, and has been deduced almost entirely from the Hebrew records. Synchronism with Assyrian and other history serves to test and to establish the truth of results that have been already attained, but it is too slight to provide a solid foundation for an alternative system." There is much truth in this. Elaborate chronological systems were once current, and the data in the Old Testament sometimes reveal conflicting and rival schemes, the relative value of which is at first unknown. Similarly, conflicting chronological evidence is found in the inscriptions of Babylonia and Assyria, and even the most circumstantial of details are now found not to be above criticism (see below, p. 152, n. 1). Mr. Fotheringham recognizes that the post-exilic chronology of Genesis must remain supreme: "it is too elaborate to be abandoned altogether, and the more so as we have nothing to put in its place" (p. 110). It represents the computations of post-exilic writers, possibly of those who possessed some acquaintance with external history, and its chief value lies in the light it throws upon their ideas of the past. Our author differs from other authorities in his date for Merneptah, whose fifth year is given as 1247 B. C. This is the year of the Exodus, and relying upon the famous Egyptian inscription, with its allusion to the destruction of the crops of Israel, he notes that the time of the year exactly coincides with the Passover and the month of Abib. Strong support is found in the fact that 1241 B. C. would be a sabbatic year, and 1247 the first year of the week (p. 98 sq.). But we know that there were

¹ The question of a disaster to Jerusalem and Judah subsequent to 586 is involved with literary theories (e. g. date of Lamentations, &c.) which still divide Biblical scholars. The mysterious blank with the disappearance of Zerubbabel seems to imply some catastrophe. Obscure disasters are connected with the times of Ezra and Nehemiah (Ezra iv. 12, 23; Neh. i. 3 sqq.), and not only does opinion vary in identifying Artaxerxes with the first or with the second of that name, but there is some evidence (unfortunately not conclusive) for the assumption that a very grave calamity befell the Jews under Artaxerxes III.

² Cambridge, Deighton Bell & Co. (1906).

Bedouin entering into Egypt in Merneptah's reign, and Prof. Petrie has already noticed with surprise that the Egyptians appear to have been welcoming more Semitic tribes only a few years before the Exodus (*History of Egypt*, p. 115). And other writers argue convincingly (as it might seem) for the view that the Exodus should be brought into line with the history of the Amarna period, and among the diverse attempts to "confirm" the biblical narratives (generally at no small cost to the details), there is no unanimity, and each theory devours the other. Also, Mr. Fotheringham is obliged to reduce the ordinarily accepted interval between the Exodus and the time of Solomon by about two centuries. To do this he subjects the history of the Judges to a certain amount of criticism. This is inevitable: one must either reconstruct the period from the evidence according to the best of one's judgment, or one must be content with the attempt to recover the principles upon which the chronological systems are based. But the author's results are not happy from the point of view of historical criticism, and the support which he claims in the genealogies of the ancestors of David and Zadok (one nearly double the length of the other) is misleading (p. 88 sq.).

The monarchy receives more elaborate treatment. The embarrassing data from the accession of Jehu to the fall of Samaria require some adjustment, and Mr. Fotheringham finds thirty distinct details which stand in need of a natural solution. He claims that all are removed (with the exception of two cases of apparent disagreement) by placing the fall of Samaria as late as 711 B. C. (pp. 141-3)! He remarks that the capture of 27,280 people and of fifty chariots on the occasion of the fall of Samaria is relatively inconsiderable when we recall how Sennacherib treated Judah; moreover, if the whole of the northern kingdom had been deported, who was left to pay the tribute imposed by Assyria? Although the problem of the deportation of the ten tribes cannot ignore the interesting point which Mr. Fotheringham has raised, the manner in which he upholds the chronology is extremely arbitrary, and he is obliged to throw over the Assyrian and Biblical accounts of Pekah's death (p. 56 sq.), and ignore the evidence for the importation of desert tribes into Samaria by Sargon in 715 B. C. The author's attempt to save the Biblical chronology quite overlooks the necessity of considering the data as a whole. Various traditions were extant regarding the deportation and repopling of the northern kingdom, and some allowance must be made for the possibility that the present records have been influenced by artificial theories of the duration of the kingdom of Israel. See, also, p. 161 below.

The "Century Bible" (Edinburgh; T. C. and E. C. Jack) under the capable editorship of Prof. Adeney, is a wonderful series of condensed

commentaries, scholarly, complete, tastefully got up, conveniently small and very cheap. Each volume prints the Revised Version with an amount of explanatory matter which is often remarkable, with a careful introduction, and with an index and one or two maps. It is no exaggeration to say that the volumes already published, though not all of equal merit, are really indispensable to those who would read the Bible with intelligence, and even those who work with more elaborate commentaries will find it useful to consult these pocket-editions, which in some instances are more recent and modern than their weightier and more expensive brethren. The volumes which claim a notice in these pages are the three best, and set a standard of conciseness and thoroughness which, considering their size, it would be very difficult to surpass. Dr. Skinner on Kings, Dr. Whitehouse on Isaiah i-xxxix, and Prof. Driver's more recent volume on the second half of the Minor Prophets are models of their kind, and alone are sufficient to give the series a reputation. Each volume has some distinctive features (e. g. the valuable historical introduction by Dr. Whitehouse), and represents the generally accepted views of criticism, not, however, without a measure of independence and individuality which shows a willingness to accept new conclusions when they are sufficiently well-founded.

Two monographs on the prophet Isaiah also come appropriately under consideration here. Lic. Fritz Wilke of Greifswald studies the policy of the prophet, in particular the change in his attitude towards Assyria¹. A number of passages express the conviction that Assyria was the chosen weapon of Yahweh, in others a distinctly anti-Assyrian feeling can be recognized; it is a problem which Wilke discusses fully in some 120 pages. After a preliminary survey of the material he fixes his chronological limits at 738-701 B.C. He deals in turn with the anti-Assyrian oracles, Isaiah's position at court, and his change in policy, which is to be assigned to the year 701 B.C. He then reviews the history of that period and proceeds to show that the military policy of Assyria furnishes the clue to the tone which the prophet had subsequently adopted. Some special points in this useful monograph will be noticed presently.

Fr. Küchler, an Assyriologist, discusses the position of Isaiah in regard to contemporary politics². Aroused by Winckler's treatment of Old Testament prophecy in the third edition of Schrader's *Keil-inschriften und das Alte Testament*, he proposed to test its adequacy, and although any prophet might have been chosen for the purpose, Isaiah's prophecies commended themselves for several good reasons.

¹ *Jesaja und Assur* (Leipzig, 1905).

² *Die Stellung d.s. Propheten Jesaja zur Politik seiner Zeit* (Tübingen, 1906).

Nearly half of this little pamphlet of fifty-seven pages is devoted to sketches of the history of Judah, Israel, and the surrounding peoples, in order to give some idea of the political situation at the time of Isaiah's prophecies. Numerous details here which invite remark must be left for a special consideration of the history of the monarchy. The rest of the book deals more closely with the subject, but not with the thoroughness which was to be anticipated. K  chler does not appear to be confident on the question of Isaiah's change in attitude (pp. 31, 52), and, indeed, his work seems to be influenced entirely by his desire to criticize Winckler's conclusions. Consequently he has generally gone too far in an opposite direction. We are not concerned with Winckler's view that the Israelite prophets were not merely politicians¹, but active political agents, since although a few considerations appear to support his arguments (e.g. Jeremiah's relations to Babylonia), they would be more convincing if stated in a more modified form².

The essential agreement among those who have handled the preliminary literary-critical problems of Isaiah is extremely encouraging for the possibility of future progress, although it must be owned that the evidence is often of such a kind that it is difficult to see how *decisive* solutions will be obtained. In spite of K  chler's fears (p. vii) one may still hope for fresh external evidence to illuminate the history, and much can still be done in the meantime by eliminating impossible or highly-improbable theories and by classifying more impartially and systematically conflicting arguments where confident conclusions are impossible. Many arguments have only logical and not actual validity, and as the relation between several groups of independent arguments becomes established, one will be able so to formulate the possibilities that the recovery of a single well-authenticated fact, or series of facts, will act as a touch-stone. It is only external evidence, for example, which can settle the vexed question of the date of Marduk-baladan's embassy to Hezekiah, but many subsidiary questions depend upon it. Of the one possible period

¹ This would probably be admitted ; so, e.g. Budde, *Religion of Israel to the Exile*, pp. 97 sq., 101.

² There is little in the present stories of Elijah and Elisha to prove that they were merely political emissaries, but it is naturally not inconceivable that practical politics entered into their movements to a much greater extent than the records (whose writers were not interested in political history) now show. This is a question of the underlying traditions, and Winckler is stimulating when he indicates the necessity of trying to understand these and other great figures more closely in the light of their times.

(721-710 B. C.), KÜchler argues for 720 (pp. 39, 45); Wilke for 711-710 (p. 47); while Whitehouse loyally maintains the later alternative supported by Schrader (between 704 and 702). The last-mentioned shows how improbable an early date would be; KÜchler and Wilke find the later date too short (as though Marduk-baladan knew how long his sovereignty would last); and Wilke finds support in an eclipse of the sun (March 14, 711-710) although Schiaparelli informs us that no total eclipse was visible in Palestine or in its immediate surroundings anywhere during 721-700 (see *Astronomy in the Old Testament*, § 28). In the absence of any *conclusive* evidence to throw into the balance, discussion of the various arguments would be futile.

The necessity of weighing every particle of evidence independently¹ and in relation to the problem under consideration is also usefully illustrated in the troublesome Muşri theory. In its moderate form, the theory is accepted by many writers who, in agreement with Whitehouse (p. 17), would disassociate themselves from the exaggerated form which it has often taken. Neither Wilke nor KÜchler are attracted by it, but the former concedes that it is sufficient to hold that the term Muşri-Mizraim could comprise South Palestine, including the Sinaitic peninsula (p. 72), and the latter allows that not everything which happened in Muşri is to be confined to the Nile district (p. 12). These concessions are sufficient, and each case must be decided upon its merits. But granted that certain prophecies originally referred to the non-Egyptian Muşri, it is obvious that the moment Egypt itself entered the arena there was a change in the historical situation which could be very confusing to later generations of readers. It is now so freely recognized that prophecies have often been reshaped, rewritten, or supplemented, that it would be a very hazardous undertaking to distinguish earlier references to a non-Egyptian Muşri from those which now refer to Egypt itself. At a certain undefined period Muşri is the non-Egyptian district, a few years later it is unmistakably Egypt. But the probability of the theory does not depend upon the prophetic writings and it is doubtful whether those which appear to be contemporary can be safely used to support it. To take an "extreme" instance elsewhere, if there were tribes incorporated in Israel who had originally come from the non-Egyptian Muşri, and not from Egypt proper, it is very

¹ That cuneiform evidence must also be used with discrimination (Wilke, pp. 16-18, 100 sq.; KÜchler, pp. 34, 41) has been unmistakably shown by L. W. King's recent publication of new texts of Sargon and Naram-Sin which require "literary criticism" (*Studies in Eastern History*, II, pp. 28-55, cp. also 121-3, 187-9).

evident that the present account of the Exodus clearly implies only the latter, and that the former view is only an attempt to recover the underlying tradition. But to recover an earlier form of a prophecy is more difficult, even if it is ever possible, and only the most unambiguous criteria (e.g. king So) enable one to suggest another historical background. In general, although the Musri theory can be made highly probable on several independent grounds, it is very far from being among the problems of first importance in Biblical criticism.

When a passage is found to show signs of being later than the date which the context would suggest, or of being foreign to the context, it can have a twofold value in so far as a later writer has adjusted an earlier record to his own needs, and a distinction can be drawn between the present intention of the passage and its original purpose (cp. *J. Q. R.*, XIX, 348-50). A very great deal hangs upon this feature. For example, the taunt-song over the oppressor in Isa. xiv belongs to a small self-contained section which has a number of indisputable references to the Babylonian period. But Isa. xiii. 1 expressly claims Isaiah for author, and since various linguistic usages are in accordance with Isaiah's style, the most "moderate" conclusion is that an original passage, of the Assyrian period, was subsequently reshaped and adjusted to suit a rather later age. Whitehouse and Wilke agree in rejecting the claims of the Babylonian king Nabunaid, and while the former prefers Nebuchadrezzar, Wilke follows those who support an allusion to Sennacherib (or preferably Sargon), later revision not being excluded. But the support which these latter find in 2 Kings xix. 21 sqq. is, when that passage is independently examined, that of the crushed reed (p. 154 below), and Whitehouse, in company with "moderate" and other critics, quite renounces the Isaianic authorship (p. 183). And, as one becomes convinced that the song is entirely of the Babylonian age, and that the view held by Whitehouse (also by Cheyne, Driver, Cornill, &c.) is the only plausible one, one may perceive that the advance from the recognition of a twofold element to the conviction that the evidence for the earlier form is inconclusive or illusory is one that may have to be effected elsewhere.

Next, to take a more complicated example. Isa. xxxiii represents a period of invasion, and contains Isaianic phraseology which suggests that the prophecy belonged to the Assyrian age. But again it is impossible to ignore the numerous signs of a later date, on which grounds it has been attributed to the reigns of Josiah (Kuenen) or Jehoiaikim (Whitehouse). The latter recognizes decisive post-exilic additions, and there are several details which have led Cheyne to prefer the latter half of the Persian period (possibly the reign of

Artaxerxes Ochus), and, more recently, to descend to the Maccabæan age (so also Duhm, Bickell, Marti)¹. A more fitting illustration of the intricacy of the criticism of the prophets could not be found, since the necessity of rejecting an original authorship by Isaiah, or (Ewald) one of his disciples, has not as yet received such complete adherence as the preceding example. One cannot fail to notice how the repetition of similar historical circumstances has complicated the inquiry. It is too much to say with Whitehouse that Duhm's views respecting the looseness of the canonical framework are scarcely tenable (p. 76, cp. p. 270, also Kùchler, p. v sq.); but we may demand, with Budde (*Ency. Bibl.*, col. 665, n. 1), conclusive arguments which, in the nature of the case, must be absolutely unambiguous. However, some difficulty is caused by the tremendous gap which would intervene if an original Isaianic passage had been reshaped in the Maccabæan age, and, speaking generally, if prophetic literature is referred to this late age, one is led to anticipate more traces of the history of the preceding, the Persian age, and a more considerable remnant of its literature.

Dr. Whitehouse himself would date Isa. xxxiii in the days of Jehoiakim, and this suggestion is of particular interest since the general circumstances of the last years of the Judæan kingdom have so many points of contact with the days of Isaiah (substituting Babylonia for Assyria), that some adjustment of the earlier oracles is only to be expected. But notwithstanding this, those passages which do not appear to be by Isaiah or an immediate follower, are found to be post-exilic, and the frequency with which critics have felt themselves obliged to pass at once from Isaianic to post-exilic authorship is not unimportant. In this connexion reference may be made to the long and twofold record of the relations between Hezekiah and Sennacherib. It is generally held to be later than Isaiah, and, of the two divisions, 2 Kings xviii. 17-xix. 8 is usually regarded as more trustworthy than 2 Kings xix. 9-37 (cp. Whitehouse, p. 352, Wilke, p. 91). But even the former seems to be subsequent to Ezekiel (so Cornill, *Introd.*, p. 283), and in this case the detailed narratives in which Isaiah plays his part, are posterior to the history of the last years of Jerusalem. These narratives are of the nature of prophetic biographies which may be compared with the semi-prophetic stories of Elijah and Elisha, with the fuller accounts of Jeremiah's work, or with Isa. vii, xx (Wilke, p. 11). This class of literature continues, as the book of Chronicles testifies, to later times; and the treatment of earlier tradition, in accordance with the spirit of varying ages, has found its still later expression, outside the Old Testament in the

¹ See Cheyne, *Introd. to Isaiah*, p. 172; *Ency. Bib.*, col. 2199.

"Ascension of Isaiah." Reference has already been made to this feature (above, p. 147). The part which the north-Israelite prophet Jonah played in the reign of Jeroboam II, when the yoke of Damascus was overthrown (2 Kings xiv. 25 sq.) is not to be found in the present late book which bears his name, although Winckler is only consistent with critical method when he attempts to recover an underlying tradition. Thus, the development of tradition takes place both within the Old Testament and without, and the feature is so recurrent, that often, where an actual comparison cannot be instituted, it can be legitimately inferred that a specific tradition represents only a comparatively late form of the original. In the present case it is sufficient to observe that if 2 Kings xviii. 17-xix. 8 gives us the sixth-century form of the traditions of the relations between Judah and Assyria in Hezekiah's reign, their value for the intricate history of Sennacherib's invasion can scarcely be regarded as very high. In spite of this, the record invariably plays a prominent part in the difficult question of the possibility of a second invasion by Sennacherib, which, by the way, Küchler wholly denies (p. 49 sq.)¹.

Professor Peake has stated that "it has been a characteristic of much recent criticism to make pre-exilic prophecy exclusively prophecy of judgment; this is a tendency for which little can be said²." The fact that Isaiah's child is named Shear-jashub points, he remarks, to the doctrine of the salvation of the remnant; and the same consideration is advanced by our three writers on Isaiah. Moreover, it is instructive to find that Egyptian "prophetical" literature supplies analogies for the idea of concluding with a hopeful note, and Prof. Ed. Meyer, emphasizing this feature, protests further against the stress which is laid upon internal contradictions, observing, justly enough, that the prophets cannot be judged by the rules of logic³. Accordingly he contends that the conclusion of Amos (which is usually treated as a later addition) is in all essentials genuine, and is indispensable for the book as a whole. But fortunately Meyer has supplied us with an excellent example for forming a judgment since a more decisive example of an exilic or post-exilic passage than Amos ix. 11 sqq. is unnecessary. If, now, it were true that it belonged essentially to the whole book, we should have to agree with E. Day and W. H. Chapin that Amos is post-exilic (see *American Journ. of Sem. Lang.*, XVIII, 65 sqq.). But the question cannot be so easily settled.

¹ Both Skinner and Whitehouse are against the suggestion (originally made by Sir Henry Rawlinson) of a campaign about 691 B. C.

² *Inaugural Lectures delivered by Members of the Faculty of Theology; Manchester University* (1905), p. 38.

³ *Israeliten u. ihre Nachbarstämme*, p. 453.

The evidence is reviewed by Driver (*Camb. Bible: Joel and Amos*, pp. 119-23) with his accustomed impartiality, and he dissents from the now general critical view mainly because "for a prophet to close the entire volume of his prophecies without a single gleam of hope for a happier future, is very much opposed to the analogy of prophecy." Since, therefore, the analogy of Hebrew and Egyptian prophecy requires a hopeful conclusion, which is also necessary for the completeness of the original work, the obvious solution at once presents itself that the original conclusion has been replaced by the present passage in a subsequent age. This is precisely the feature which can be recognized in the historical literature, where two passages intimately related as regards general subject-matter prove, on internal grounds, to be incompatible, thus suggesting that one of the two is a secondary form of the original¹.

Prof. Meyer's protest is also suggestive because the question constantly arises whether this or that significant indication of lateness does or does not belong essentially to the context². Both in the purely narrative as also in the prophetic literature the presence of a late hand is not merely significant for the literary fortunes of the writing under consideration but regularly brings the problem whether the traces are sporadic, due to glosses, insertions and the like, or whether the passage as a whole belongs to the later date. A certain decision is often difficult, sometimes impossible. If one can be sure that a passage is essentially a unit the occurrence of unambiguous post-exilic data is decisive; and even if no decision can be safely hazarded, the repeated recurrence of post-exilic data ultimately has more weight than the criteria which would otherwise appear to support the earlier date which at first seems necessary. To a certain extent the recognition and explanation of these features mark all the difference between the grades of critics and criticism. We may contrast the critical view regarding the various sources (pre-exilic and post-exilic) of the Pentateuch with the traditional standpoint which claims an "essential Mosaicity," but will allow the probability of later revision, &c.³ It is interesting also to observe the trend of the criticism of Zech. ix-xiv, where considerable perplexity has been caused by the mingling of apparent pre-exilic data with those which were decisively post-exilic. The inevitable compromise—early prophecies adapted to post-exilic situations—was and still is often main-

¹ Cp. *J. Q. R.*, XIX, 358 (middle).

² Cp. Meyer and 1 Sam. xi. 8; *J. Q. R.*, XIX, 352, n. 1.

³ Contrast, also, the defenders of Daniel who had been employed chiefly in cutting Daniel to pieces (Bevan, *Dan.*, p. 8), and the accepted critical view that the book as a whole is late.

tained, but it is now recognized to be inadequate by most scholars and the post-exilic date of the whole has become a commonplace¹. This conclusion at once furnishes an array of considerations which agree with what has now become evident: that the criteria which seem to tell against a post-exilic date are not, on the whole, so decisive as those which appear to prove it². Nothing could show more clearly the delicate nature of the criticism of the prophetic writings, and those who protest against the "dissection" of prophecies should observe the alternative. It may be remarked in this connexion that when Duhm recently ascribed the book of Habakkuk to the time of Alexander the Great, he drew special attention to the inherent superiority of a theory which avoided the extent of dismemberment which other critics had felt obliged to allow in order to maintain the traditional date.

In dealing with the general questions of the criticism of the prophets and with the validity or ambiguity of certain criteria, we find that the solutions of the problems depend upon Biblical theology rather than upon history in its narrower aspect. But the two cannot be separated. Further, when there is good reason to conclude that an earlier passage has been supplemented or revised by a post-exilic writer, the vicissitudes of that record are being recovered, and the results of the most moderate criticism of the present day already furnish much indirect evidence which sooner or later will have to be viewed along with our knowledge of Israelite history and of that "deep cleft" between the pre-exilic and post-exilic periods. The question of the vicissitudes of the literature is more than merely interesting. Are we to accept the mechanical view that after the fall of Samaria the north-Israelite literature was carried over into Judah? The assumption is not a necessary one unless we follow the Judæan compiler and ignore the northern district after the eighth century. It would be premature to make other suggestions, because a certain portion of our Old Testament was extant in some form in Judah by the commencement of the sixth century, and again fresh questions arise regarding *its* fate. Whatever view may be taken of the character of the exile as a catastrophe and of the particular manner in which later editors collected, revised, recast or supplemented earlier literature, it is obviously necessary to formulate some idea of the "how, when and where." Literary criticism recog-

¹ Cp. Driver, *Cent. Bible*, p. 230 sq. (so also Wellhausen, Stade, Budde, &c.). Reference should also be made to W. R. Smith, *O. T. J. C.*, p. 102 sq.

² viz. the language of Zech. ix-xiv (contrast that of Chronicles), and the general allusions which would *otherwise* seem to require a pre-exilic date (ix. 10, x. 1, 10 sq., xi. 14). Cp. further, *J. Q. R.*, XIX, p. 360.

nizes an unbroken chain, pre-exilic records pass over into post-exilic hands and yet the exile intervenes. Were they conveyed to Babylon and brought back at the Return, or were they treasured in Palestine? ¹ The questions are bound up with the problem of the Return, in discussing which it has often been easy to exaggerate the low position of religion among the remnant. But not only does the condition of the later Samaritans furnish indirect evidence for the religious and political circumstances of the centuries immediately preceding, but it is very clear that the preservation of Jeremiah's writings—scarcely removed by exiles to Babylon or by fugitives to Egypt—implies the existence of communities who were by no means in danger of relapsing into heathenism after the recent fulfilment of the prophets' warnings. It would be imprudent to speculate on the character of the communities we have inferred, but it is not out of place to observe that literary criticism has recognized a pre-exilic and post-exilic Deuteronomic school involving a continuity of existence and thought, but has not seriously considered the literary results and the history of the period in their mutual bearing.

These questions will rest upon a combination of literary and historical criticism in which the historical books, Joshua-Kings, require a more comprehensive treatment. Let us briefly consider the book of Kings. The view prevails that it was compiled by a Deuteronomic redactor between the date of Josiah's reforms and the captivity; it has been supplemented (Jehoiachin died in 561); and there are clear traces of a Deuteronomic hand which is indisputably post-exilic. The book of Deuteronomy itself consists of at least two clearly-marked portions, and a twofold Deuteronomic strand is admitted in Joshua, has been recognized in Judges (Budde), and may probably be recovered in Samuel. In the absence of any critical study of the historical work Joshua-Kings as a whole or of any special treatment of the relation between its Deuteronomic elements, we are obliged to confine ourselves to preliminary remarks based upon the results of others. Dr. Skinner's admirable introduction and careful treatment of the literary details renders full discussion unnecessary, and his conclusions and those of other representative scholars form an adequate starting-point.

The present connexion between 1 Kings i-ii, and 2 Sam. ix-xx is indisputable, but granted that the latter owes its incorporation to a post-Deut. hand (Budde, Nowack, Kennedy), we must agree with Budde (*Sam.*, p. xi) that 1 Kings i, ii. 1-9, 13 sqq. also were wanting in

¹ Skinner on 1 Kings iv. 24 recognizes that the phrase "beyond the River" does not necessarily imply that the writer was living east of the Euphrates. Some arguments for the Babylonian home of a later redactor in Kings are given by Holzhey, *Buch der Könige*, p. 51.

the Deuteronomic edition. That these had *previously* found a place in the very writings which D used has not been proved, and it may naturally be assumed *a priori* that they are old narratives which had had a separate existence¹. It may be left open whether D in 1 Kings ii. 2-4 indicates a separate Deut. redaction of the independent narratives or is due to the second Deut. hand (D²) who either placed or found the passages in their present context. The question will rest upon the relation between D¹ and D² elsewhere.

Next, 1 Kings ii in the LXX suggests either the existence of an independent recension, or another attempt to arrange the material for the history of Solomon. How late the fluctuation of the text of the first quarter of the book of Kings continued is evident also from a comparison of other narratives of Solomon's reign with the LXX and with 2 Chronicles, and from the LXX account of the separation. Chap. xiii is a post-Deut. insertion, and the secondary character of the stories of Ahijah and Shemaiah seems well-established². For the fuller narratives of Judæan history we have (a) the semi-biographical passages of Isaiah, which, following Cornill, are later than Ezekiel (see above); (b) the more detailed accounts of the last years of Jerusalem; and (c) the series of passages connected with the temple. In regard to (b), the view seems to prevail that the fragments in Kings have been utilized by the writer of the more complete and elaborate narratives in Jeremiah, although xxv. 23-6 is surely an abridgement of the vivid record in Jer. xl. 7-xli. 18. However, when one contrasts the promise to Josiah (2 Kings xxii. 20) with his tragic death, the oracle to Zedekiah (Jer. xxxiv. 5) with his actual fate, and the doom pronounced upon Jehoiakim (ibid. xxii. 18 sq., xxxvi. 30) with his peaceful end (2 Kings xxiv. 6, 2 Chron. xxxvi. 8, see LXX and Lucian) it is difficult to be confident that the last word has been said upon the history of this period. Next, à propos of (c), it may be noticed with Robertson Smith (*Prophets of Israel*, p. 147) that nearly all the events dated by the years of the kings of Jerusalem have reference to the affairs of the temple, which at once suggests a close connexion between the Judæan chronological system and the temple-history. Thus, apart from later fluctuation in the history of the text, there is some reason to believe that the more detailed accounts of Judæan history had had a separate existence down to a relatively late date (not earlier than the reign of Josiah). To this one must add that in the case

¹ For some points of *historical* criticism, see *J. Q. R.*, XIX, 379 sq.

² See W. R. Smith, *Old Test. in Jewish Church* (²), p. 118. Chap. xiv is important for criticism because of the relation between the Deut. passage vv. 7-16 and xvi. 1-4 (which is a parallel to ver. 7), xxi. 20-4 and 2 Kings ix. 7-10.

of both Abijam and Manasseh the elimination of purely editorial details or admittedly Deut. elements leaves little political information, while in the case of Rehoboam we appear to owe our knowledge of Shishak's invasion to a writer whose chief concern lay with the temple (1 Kings xiv. 25 sq.).

The relatively extensive remains of the north Israelite literature stand out in strong contrast, although here too one cannot fail to notice the occasions where little political history is recorded or where the elimination of later elements leaves an almost complete and continuous record of successive kings¹. For a small period the history is remarkably full, and it concentrates itself upon the events which led up to the accession of Jehu as surely as Judaeon history is at its fullest for the reigns of David and Solomon and the separation of the north from the south. It is very probable that the numerous Israelite records point to an originally political narrative utilized as the basis of a great work on northern prophecy (Skinner, p. 29), and when the date of this nucleus has been determined a fresh starting-point for the history of the book of Kings will have been obtained. The sympathy for the northern kingdom which these narratives manifest appears again in the account of the Aramaean wars (2 Kings xiii. 4 sq., 23, xiv. 26 sq.), and the evidence is noteworthy, not only for its contrast to the later anti-Israelite feeling of Judaeon writers, as for the *possibility* that the early pragmatic tendency which is found in the northern prophet Hosea could have produced a history of the monarchy which approximated at least the Deuteronomic spirit. Moreover, it seems worthy of consideration that the "Chronicles of the kings of Israel" *could* contain extremely neutral and dispassionate accounts of Judaeon affairs (viz. the war between Amaziah and Jehoash), and that there is some reason for attributing to Deuteronomy, at one stage at least, a distinct interest in matters outside Judah itself².

It is recognized that Judaeon hands have given us the present book of Kings and that these incorporated earlier narratives (including the north Israelite records). The synchronistic notices are assigned to the later Deuteronomic redactor, although in view of the remarkable deviations in the LXX "it seems more probable that they were inserted at a much later stage in the history of the text" (Skinner,

¹ So the history of the successors of Jeroboam II, like that of the kings from Jeroboam I to the accession of Omri, appears in its older form as a fairly consecutive narrative (see, for example, C. F. Kent, *Israel's Historical and Biographical Narratives*, pp. 210 sq., 249 sq.).

² See R. H. Kennett, *Journ. of Theolog. Stud.*, 1906, pp. 487 (Deut. addressed to *all* Israel), 498.

p. 39). Everything goes to show that the book has had a complicated history, and it is necessary to take into account the form and even the arrangement of the book previous to the insertion of the synchronisms. But even the lengths of the reigns, which are very naturally held to be of older origin, allow 240 years for the northern kingdom and double the number from the foundation of the Temple to the Return, and this artificiality, which must be attributed to Judæan writers, presupposes a system later than the Return¹. The attempt to distinguish between the present post-exilic book and its earlier pre-exilic Judæan form becomes more difficult when we consider the two main Deuteronomistic hands. The criteria for the recognition of D² are indisputable, but for the pre-exilic date of D¹ the evidence is not so clear, and rests mainly (a) upon passages which imply the continued existence of the Judæan state, dynasty and temple; and (b) upon language (especially the phrase "unto this day"), which might appear very unnatural in the mouth of a writer after the Exile. Apart from this, a distinction between the apparently exilic D¹ and the certainly post-exilic D² cannot be safely maintained: "the two redactors belonged to the same Deuteronomic school of historians, and are so much alike in their principles and their cast of thought that it is not always possible to assign an editorial insertion with confidence to the one rather than to the other" (Skinner, p. 22). But yet the Exile intervenes! Dr. Skinner has recognized that the evidence for (a) above is not absolutely decisive by itself (p. 20), and to this it must be added that the phrase "unto this day," upon which very great weight is invariably laid, gives us everywhere some writer's opinion, but does not necessarily afford an indication of its date or the accuracy of the application².

¹ See W. R. Smith, art. "Kings," *Ency. Brit.* (9), p. 84 b (*Ency. Bib.*, col. 2667, § 4 end).

² So Solomon's albug-wood (1 Kings x. 12, contrast 2 Chron. ix. 11); the naming of Cabul and Joktheel and the healing of the waters (1 Kings ix. 13; 2 Kings xiv. 7, ii. 22), Jehu's destruction of the temple of Baal (2 Kings x. 27), the captivity of Israel (2 Kings xvii. 23), and the religion of the inhabitants of Samaria (*ibid.*, 34, 41). More importance has been attached to the use of the phrase in connexion with the division of the kingdom (1 Kings xii. 19, repeated in 2 Chron. x. 19), the independence of the Edomites (2 Kings viii. 22, cp. 2 Chron. xxi. 10, and note the subsequent allusions in 2 Kings xiv. 7, 10, 22), and the loss of Elath (xvi. 6), but it is difficult to see how these *prove* a pre-exilic date. Finally, in 1 Kings viii. 8 (where the ends of the staves of the ark are visible) the writer speaks of the ark as still in existence, and thus the problem of its fate is involved. The whole passage is now Deut. with several traces of

According to the current view the first Deuteronomic compiler wrote after the reforms of Josiah. The description of Josiah's measures (after the reign of Manasseh) is written by one who lived under the Deut. law, and at least is not contemporary. Reforms of a Deut. character are also attributed to Hezekiah the son of Ahaz, but these are rightly regarded as exaggerated, because the writer himself "belongs to the Deuteronomic school, as his style shows, and would naturally take this for granted" (cp. Addis, *Doc. of Hex.*, II, p. 9). In 2 Kings xxii sq. there are not only signs of Deuteronomic revision but very distinct traces of the kindred post-exilic hand. Opinion differs as to the extent to which the original narrative has been supplemented and revised, and consequently we shall refrain from laying any stress upon the Rev. E. Day's statement that "twenty-one and a half of the twenty-seven verses of the story of the reformation in the opinion of critical scholars are 'late'¹." Next, quite apart from the literary problem, it is very questionable whether the writings of contemporary prophets justify the conviction that the reforms were of a very sweeping or successful character. It is true that the compiler seems to have thought that the worship at the high-places ceased from Josiah's reign onwards, but Jeremiah and Ezekiel represent religious conditions which agree neither with Josiah's drastic measures nor with their assumed sequel. However, on the ordinary view it is certain that the Deuteronomic law would be in force at the rebuilding of the Second Temple, and if we agree that the teaching which the Deut. compiler enforces is the responsibility of the sovereign for the purity of the national religion², the time of the reorganization of Judah under Zerubbabel has special claims to our notice. On general *a priori* grounds we should expect this great period to have left its mark somewhere upon the narratives. But, in addition to this, it is a period which satisfies the scheme of Judaeon chronology, and both the existence of the Temple and the

a later hand akin to the Priestly Code. The words "unto this day" are omitted by the LXX, and look very much like a gloss suggested by Exod. xxv. 15. The recurrence of the phrase here and elsewhere in Chronicles, and the considerations furnished by Zech. ix-xiv (ix. 10, xi. 14 even imply the existence of the ten tribes) do not appear to give the evidence the value usually ascribed to it.

¹ "The Promulgation of Deuteronomy," *Journ. of Bib. Lit.*, 902, p. 202. (Mr. Day follows Pres. W. R. Harper in the literary analysis, see *ibid.*, p. 198 n. 1.)

² G. F. Moore, *Ency. Bib.*, col. 2079, § 7. One may compare the hopes inspired by the presence of Zerubbabel in the writings of Haggai and Zechariah.

presence of a member of the Davidic dynasty clearly correspond with those passages whose pre-exilic origin is more apparent than real. Consequently there seems to be good reason for the assumption that a more appropriate date for the Judaeen compilation of Kings may be found provisionally in the age of Zerubbabel and the Second Temple, and additional support for this could be claimed in—not to mention earlier writers—the more recent discussions by E. Day (note 1, p. 162) and R. H. Kennett (note 1, p. 164), who agree, on independent grounds, in the conclusion that the pre-exilic date of Deuteronomy itself is hazardous¹.

Although there are several points in favour of the more recent views, more cumulative evidence is necessary before they can be confidently accepted, and it is obviously necessary to know more about the literary structure of Kings, the date of the north Israelite records, and the nature of the Deuteronomic redactions. Dr. Skinner has suspected that the "framework" of the history lay before the Deut. compiler in a simpler form (p. 11, n. 1), and indeed the annalistic framework which can be found in Samuel resembles, but is not identical with, the style of D². The important observation is also made that the phraseology of 2 Kings xiii. 3-5 (Aramean wars) "has remarkable affinities with some parts of the 'framework' of the book of Judges, which might almost suggest that the whole was from one hand" (p. 348; cp. Benzinger and Kittel), and it is noteworthy that the only Judaeen judge (Othniel), who, by the way, stands at the head of the *Israelite* figures, owes his presence, according to Budde, to a secondary Deut. redactor. The possibility of a late *northern* history of the monarchy may find support in the belief that a pragmatical treatment of the life of Saul can be distinguished from a specifically Judaeen (and pro-Davidic) tendency, and in the fact that some of the strongest anti-Israelite passages in Kings are already recognized to be post-Deut. (1 Kings. xiii), or from the hand of the later Deuteronomist (the review in 2 Kings xvii. 29 sqq.).

¹ Josiah's reputation for righteousness and justice (Jer. xxii. 15 sq.), his election by the people of the land, and the distinctively social-reforming tendency of Deuteronomy, may suggest that his endeavours to repair previous social conditions may have been the foundation of the present narratives. There is a relationship between 2 Kings xi sq. and xxii sq., however, which must also be taken into consideration.

² So 1 Sam. xiv. 47-51 is suggestive of D, but H. P. Smith and Budde are not in agreement as to its precise character. Elsewhere there are passages where it is difficult to decide between a form of E which approximates D and an early form of D itself. How close the relation can appear is evident from Steuernagel's commentary on Joshua.

Moreover, Prof. Kennett, on other grounds, has stated his conclusion that there was a rapprochement between the north and south during the sixth century (after the fall of Jerusalem)¹, and the view is so inherently natural that it would probably have been recognized independently by others were one not influenced by ideas based upon the later unfriendly relations between Judah and the Samaritans. But the schism presupposes an earlier union as inevitably as divorce can only follow a marriage, and recent study on the Samaritans would lend its support to Kennett's remark that "it is certain that all the worshippers of Yahweh in Palestine had accepted the law of the One Sanctuary a considerable time before the mission of Nehemiah; otherwise the acceptance by the Samaritans of the whole Pentateuch would be inexplicable²." Many points must be left until the post-exilic history has been independently handled, but it now seems not improbable that for the literature as well as for the history we must view in a new light the difference between the period before and that after the separation. In the earlier period, we can assume the existence of a Deuteronomic spirit in the north, the result of a tendency already apparent in the writings of the north Israelite prophet Hosea³. It is (like Hosea himself) not necessarily partial to the northern kingdom, nor is it hostile to Judah (again cp. Hosea?), since we have seen that it could handle Judaeon history without passion or animus (p. 160 above). But in the later period, Judaeon hostility towards its neighbour becomes prominent, and the interests are specifically Judaeon and anti-Israelite. It is unnecessary at this stage to ask whether the later writers more sharply emphasized the religious tone in the writings they took over, or how far they were influenced by the recent schism. At all events, for the history of the earliest periods, when all the tribes were united, strong feeling one way or the other is hardly to be expected; it is in dealing with the separate kingdoms and in the events which led up to the institution of the monarchy in Israel (Saul) and in Judah (David) that variation of standpoint can be recognized and there are independent grounds for the belief that Saul's history has been intentionally subordinated to that of David. The hypothesis that late Judaeon writers incorporated literature of northern origin with subsequent drastic revision

¹ See *Journ. of Theolog. Stud.*, Jan., 1905, pp. 161 sqq.; July, 1906, pp. 481 sqq.

² *Ibid.*, 1906, p. 498. Cp. especially J. A. Montgomery's *The Samaritans, the Earliest Jewish Sect* (Philadelphia, 1907). According to this writer, "both Judaism and Samaritanism go back to a common foundation in the circumstances of the age of the Exile in the sixth century" (p. 61).

³ See further, *J. Q. R.*, XIX, 817, n. 2.

and with the addition of Judæan literature of distinct origin involves important questions both literary (especially the twofold Deut. redaction) and historical (the extensive nucleus in 1 Kings xvii-2 Kings x; the Exile and the Return), and although it is obvious that it stands in need of an examination in the light of other portions of the Old Testament, certain independent considerations already seem to support it¹.

That these arguments have been taking us further and further away from generally accepted views will be recognized, but "advanced" criticism is so frequently a more thorough application of legitimate principles to legitimate results, that it is more just to determine whether novel results are merely arbitrary, fantastic or unnecessary, than to object to them merely because they are new and because of their divergence both (a) from the strictly traditional standpoint or (b) from the standpoint of "moderate" criticism or of individual critics. It is necessary to insist that archaeological research (which has been steadily kept in view throughout) may force a change, and that continued evidence of the prevalence of old oriental culture may bring in its train the presence of elements of old oriental religion utterly opposed to current views of Israel. The conviction that a very considerable body of literature was extant in ancient Israel does not prove that this has necessarily survived. We cannot deny to post-exilic writers some acquaintance with the history of the past; but we have not the history of the age of Khammurabi, or of the Hyksos, of the Amarna period, or even of the invasions of the Purusati and others in the days of Ramses. Even Shishak's invasion we apparently owe to a writer who was more interested in the temple than in political events. Prophetical writings, too, may have been current from the times of the earliest prophets, and who shall say

¹ In the study of the traditions of Saul and David it seemed that the traditions of central Palestine were older, that they had incorporated elements of south origin (i. e. an interest was shown in Judah and South Judæan clans), that the Judæan traditions subsequently gained the supremacy (i. e. the Judæan standpoint now predominates), and that there had been a late introduction of Judæan narratives and local history (*J. Q. R.*, XIX, pp. 390 sq.) Moreover, from a survey of the traditions which, from the evidence for the "Levites," are seen to be closely related, it is very probable that the fall of Shiloh and of the priesthood of Eli was originally associated with the northern history—the iniquity of the priesthood and the disaster are evidently connected by the writer of 1 Sam. iii. But the distinctively Judæan standpoint connects the fall of Eli's house with the rise of Zadok (1 Sam. ii. 27 sqq.) and the supremacy of the Zadokite priests of Jerusalem over their brethren (see, further, *Critical Notes on O. T. History*, Introd. p. xiv, n. 1).

when the first prophet arose in Palestine ? But even as we have not the original writings of Jonah the prophet, so, too, much of the extant prophecies are in a late dress. We are warned that as the patriarchal figures in the book of Jubilees differ from those of the Priestly writer, and as the latter are different from the earlier representations preserved by P, so, the figures of the patriarchs in the second millenium—a thousand years before P—were certainly dressed in accordance with the thought and tradition of that period. Developments of this nature must be, and are constantly recognized, and when we are fortunately able to institute decisive comparisons, we cannot regret the growth. The difference between the specifically Israelite form of the stories of the creation and the deluge, and the older shape which Assyriological research has recovered, is detrimental to all ideas of the originality or priority of Israelite tradition, but it has been an enormous gain for the determination of those features which give the Old Testament a lasting value. The greatest miracle in Jewish history is the gradual transformation of elements which would never have influenced the world had they not been rewritten in the form in which they now survive, and the continued advance of Biblical criticism, although seemingly ever more drastic, will more emphatically reveal the presence of factors which are not to be measured by ordinary human knowledge.

STANLEY A. COOK.